



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,721	10/01/2007	Steffen Schmalz	SCHM3013/JJC	6607
23364	7590	03/18/2010	EXAMINER	
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC			BITAR, NANCY	
625 SLATERS LANE				
FOURTH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314-1176			2624	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/18/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/583,721	SCHMALZ ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NANCY BITAR	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 December 2009.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 March 2009 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action see pages 1-24, filed 12/9/2009 is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Examiner Notes

Examiner cites particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the applicant fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 1-3,5- 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al (US 2003/0132281) in view of Giering et al (US 7,487,919)**

As to claims 1-2, Jones et al teaches the method for recognizing forged bank notes with a bank note processing machine comprising the steps, processing the bank note with the bank note

Art Unit: 2624

processing machine; checking the bank notes with comparative data stored by the bank note processing machine and (see applicant admitted preamble, specification paragraph [0004]) ,

using additional comparative data for new types of forgeries ,which are not recognized based on the comparative data derived from authentic bank notes and known forgeries (figure 15; paragraph [093] and paragraph [0127])

wherein the bank notes to be checked are compared with both the comparative data and the additional comparative data for new types of forgeries so as to determine whether a forged bank note is present (see figure 16; adapted to receive a plurality of currency bills and an image scanner adapted to obtain an image of a currency bill and to extract a serial number from the image of the currency bill. An authentication and discrimination unit is also included to perform counterfeit testing on the currency bill. Coupled to the input receptacle is a transport mechanism adapted to transport each of the currency bills one at a time from the input receptacle past the image scanner and the authentication and discrimination unit to at least one output receptacle. A memory storage is adapted to store the obtained image of each of the currency bills. The memory is also adapted to store at least one serial number of counterfeit currency bills. A controller is adapted to update the memory with a serial number of a currency bill determined to be counterfeit by the authentication and discrimination unit, paragraph [0183-0185]. While Jones meets a number of the limitations of the claimed invention, as pointed out more fully above, Jones fails to specifically teach “provide the comparative data derived from authentic bank notes and known forgeries and the additional comparative data for new types of forgeries that may have arisen after the comparative data derived from authentic bank notes and known forgeries was established. Giering et al teaches a bank note contain a high-security

Art Unit: 2624

feature (new forgeries) , incorporated in or applied to the paper, consisting of a mixture of two different substances and a low-security feature (i.e. comparative data) consisting of another substance. In a high-security area, such as e.g. a bank, the high-security feature is checked, whereas in a low-security area, such as e.g. in publicly accessible vending machines, only the low-security feature is checked. Giering clearly teaches when bank notes paid in prior transactions are paid out again in subsequent transactions, it is particularly important, that a quick recognition of the existence of new forgeries or an adaptation of the evaluation algorithms to these new forgeries is effected, which are not recognized by the existing evaluation algorithms, since with such cash machines the acceptability of the bank notes is effected only on the basis of the checking of the low security category (see abstract, figure 2 and column 8 lines 1-60) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to check the security feature in Jones by using new forgeries order to prevent fraud and the circulation of counterfeit money .Therefore, the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by applicant.

As to claim 3, Giering teaches the limitation of claim 3 in claim 15 and figure 1

As to claim 5, Jones et al teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the additional comparative data (serial numbers, paragraph [0183]) for new types of forgeries are derived and produced from the new type of forgery after the first occurrence of the new type of forgery (paragraph [0183-0185]) ; see also paragraph [0127-0129]).

3. Claims 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al (US 2003/0132281) in view of Giering et al (US 7,487,919) and further in view of Pernot et al (EP 1255232).

While Jones meets a number of the limitations of the claimed invention, as pointed out more fully above, Jones fails to specifically teach the comparative data and additional comparative data for new types of forgeries are available for each possible position of the bank notes. Specifically, Pernot et al. teaches the four different positions of introducing the bank note where the acceptance of banknote by authenticity checking machines in all possible positions of the banknote (paragraph [0051]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to (authenticate the bank note is different position in order the new type of forgery can be effected independently of the respective position .Therefore, the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by applicant.

Claims 6-7 differ from claim 1-3 only in that claim 1-3 are method claims whereas claim 6-7 are an apparatus claim. Thus, claims 6-7 are analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims above.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NANCY BITAR whose telephone number is (571)270-1041. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (7:30a.m. to 5:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vikkram Bali can be reached on 571-272-7415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nancy Bitar/
Examiner, Art Unit 2624

/WESLEY TUCKER/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2624